

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by De Lang (US 6,020,912).

5

Response:

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to distinguish from the cited prior art. Each of these claims now contains limitations from the original claim 3 specifying that a playback acceleration of data to be played is calculated according to an acceleration time, an initial playback speed, and a target playback speed. This calculated playback acceleration is then used for playing the data. As claim 3 was indicated as allowable, and all of the limitations contained in the original claim 3 are now present in the currently amended claims 1 and 5, claims 1 and 5 should now be in allowable form as well.

10

15

Claims 3 and 14 have been cancelled as a result of the claim amendments, and other amendments have been made to claims 4, 6, and 9-12 in order to ensure consistency with their respective base claims. No new matter is added through the claim amendments.

20

As a result of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 5, the applicant submits that these claims are now patentable over the cited prior art. Furthermore, claims 2, 9, 11, 13, and 15 are dependent on claims 1 and 5, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15 is therefore respectfully requested.

25

2. Rejection of claims 6, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Appl. No. 10/708,200
Amdt. dated October 04, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 11, 2007

Claims 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Lang (US 6,020,912) in view of Guyer (US 6,130,624).

Response:

5 Claims 6, 8, and 10 are dependent on claim 5, and should be allowed if claim 5 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 6, 8, and 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

10 Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Lang (US 6,020,912) in view of Guyer (US 6,130,624) in further view of Seffernick et al. (US 6,040,823).

Response:

15 Claim 7 is dependent on claim 5, and should be allowed if claim 5 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 7 is therefore respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

20 Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Lang (US 6,020,912) in view of Guyer (US 6,130,624) in further view of Darbee et al. (US 6,002,450).


Response:

25 Claim 12 is dependent on claim 5, and should be allowed if claim 5 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/708,200
Amdt. dated October 04, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 11, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 10.04.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)